arXiv:quant-ph/0112166v5 3 Apr 2002

Towards a unification of physics and information theory

I. Devetak*
IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

A. E. Staples
Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540

February 1, 2008

Abstract

A common framework for quantum mechanics, thermodynamics and information theory is presented. It is accomplished by reinterpreting the mathematical formalism of Everett's many-worlds theory of quantum mechanics and augmenting it to include preparation according to a given ensemble. The notion of *directed entanglement* is introduced through which both classical and quantum communication over quantum channels are viewed as entanglement transfer. This point is illustrated by proving the Holevo bound and quantum data processing inequality relying exclusively on the properties of directed entanglement. Within the model, quantum thermodynamic entropy is also related to directed entanglement, and a simple proof of the second law of thermodynamics is given.

We present a novel framework for quantum mechanics which we argue to be more conducive to the development of quantum information theory. Our motivation is both practical and one of principles. On the practical side, we find the standard Copenhagen framework to be unsatisfactory in various ways. For example, there are many different reasons for a quantum system Q to be described by some mixed density operator ρ_Q. It could be prepared from some ensemble of pure states, it could be a result of an unobserved measurement performed on a pure state, it could be entangled with some other physical system, or it could be some combination of these three. A related issue is that classical and quantum communication over quantum channels appear to be rather independent problems [1]. Another dichotomy is that two protagonists may share information about a physical event through *communication* rather than through common observation, yet these are treated very differently.

Regarding principles, we would like to view the laws of physics in information theoretical terms. This attitude may be traced to Wheeler's motto "It from Bit" [2], and Wigner's observation that physics merely describes correlations between events [3]. The two are unified by the statement that *the totality of conceptual experience can be described in terms of correlated random variables*; this will allow us to make contact with Shannon's information theory [4] in which random variables are the carriers of information. For instance, two protagonists sharing the same physical world is no more than classical correlations between the states of their knowledge regarding that world. Similarly, the observation of definite physical laws is no more than classical correlations between states of knowledge regarding two consecutive acts of measurement, or preparation and measurement, depending on the experiment. A ball kicked by Alice seen as obeying Newton's deterministic laws

*Electronic address: id21@cornell.edu

of motion is merely a statement about the correlation between her knowledge of its initial velocity (preparation) and that of its position when it hits the ground (measurement).

The model we present here curtails the deficiencies of the Copenhagen interpretation mentioned above, while embodying this information-theoretical principle. Perhaps surprisingly, this can be accomplished by reinterpreting the mathematical formalism of a radically different theory of quantum mechanics, Everett's Many-Worlds interpretation [5], and augmenting it to include *preparation*, an indispensable ingredient for describing communication [1]. In our model the universe $\mathcal{U}$ is divided into subsystems which can either belong to the set of "physical" entities $\mathcal{P}$ or to the set of instances of knowledge $\mathcal{K}$. The set $\mathcal{K}$ partly corresponds to what Everett called "observers", by which he essentially meant another physical system, such as a quantum computer or the brain. Assuming that observers are entirely "physical" leads to the unsolved basis problem [6]. Here we do not imbue $\mathcal{K}$ with a "physical" interpretation; it merely keeps track of the conceptual experience of the observer/preparer in relation to what has been observed/prepared. We pause to justify the unconventional step of including conceptual experience in a physical model. Everett points out in [5] that physical theories have always consisted of two parts, the "formal" mathematical part and the "interpretive" part: a set of rules for connecting the mathematical formalism to our conceptual experience. He warns that the unrigorous nature of the second part often leads to a successful model being mistakenly identified with "reality." It is thus the conceptual experience that is the subject of physics, and including it in the model itself can only help avoid the above pitfall.

The set $\mathcal{K}$ is divided into subsets associated with particular protagonists, such as $\mathcal{K}_{Alice}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{Bob}$. At any given time the universe is described by a pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$. The state of some subsystem A is described by the density matrix obtained from $|\Psi\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ by tracing out the rest of the universe $\mathcal{U}/A$:

$$\rho_A = tr_{\mathcal{U}/A}|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{\mathcal{U}}. \tag{1}$$

The Hilbert space of $\mathcal{U}$ is constantly being augmented by new instances of knowledge, initially in some fixed pure state (although they immediately get entangled with already existing memebers of $\mathcal{U}$; as pure states they serve no function). Otherwise, $|\Psi\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ can only evolve from one moment to the next according to some unitary operator U

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \longrightarrow U\,|\Psi\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}, \tag{2}$$

possibly entangling the different subsystems. These are the building blocks of the theory. Now we illustrate how measurement, preparation and communication are described in terms of it.

(i) **Measurement.** The measurement process *à la* Everett is described as follows. Bob wishes to perform an elementary measurement on some m-dimensional physical system L in the orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle_L\}$. Denote by the *reference system* R that subsystem of the universe $\mathcal{U}$ which is entangled with L, so that RL is in a pure state

$$|\Psi\rangle_{RL} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j |\phi_j\rangle_R |j\rangle_L.$$

The *unobserved* measurement consists of the measurement apparatus M, initially in some pure state, becoming entangled with RL via some unitary operator acting on LM only. The state of RLM becomes

$$|\Psi\rangle_{RLM} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j |\phi_j\rangle_R |j\rangle_L |j\rangle_M,$$

where $\{|j\rangle_M\}$ is an orthonormal basis for M. The *observed* measurement consists of the production of an m-dimensional system $B \in \mathcal{K}_{Bob}$ in some pure state, followed by a unitary transformation

acting on MB only. This results in

$$|\Psi\rangle_{RLMB} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j |\phi_j\rangle_R |j\rangle_L |j\rangle_M |j\rangle_B,$$

where $|j\rangle_B$ form an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$ of B. These should be thought of as shorthand notation for the mutually exclusive states of Bob's knowledge with respect to the observation of M, $|j\rangle_B \equiv |\textsf{observe } M \textsf{ in the state } |j\rangle_M\rangle_B$. The density matrix ρ_B of B, viewed in the $|j\rangle_B$ basis, has diagonal elements $|\lambda_j|^2$. We define the associated random variable $\mathbf{B}$ as

$$Pr(\mathbf{B} = j) = \langle j|\rho_B|j\rangle_B = |\lambda_j|^2.$$

The Shannon entropy of $\mathbf{B}$ is defined as $H(\mathbf{B}) = -\sum_j Pr(\mathbf{B} = j) \log Pr(\mathbf{B} = j)$. The crucial point is the following. We started off by modelling the mutually exclusive states of Bob's knowledge by an orthonormal basis for B. If ρ_B were diagonal in this basis, it would have the natural interpretation of B being in the state $|j\rangle_B$ with probability $Pr(\mathbf{B} = j)$, and thus isomorphic to the random variable $\mathbf{B}$. However, in general off-diagonal elements do exist; the theory then postulates that Bob is blind to this fact, since it is not in accord with his classical probabilistic vision, referred to henceforth as "diagonal vision." This is, of course, just a manner of speech; all that is being said is that only the diagonal elements have an intepretation.

One might think that if Bob's experience is not based in "reality" there should be a discrepancy between his experience and that of others. This is not the case. If his friend Charlie takes a look at the readout of M, a new system C will be produced in such a way that the joint system $RLMBC$ is now in the state

$$|\Psi\rangle_{RLMBC} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j |\phi_j\rangle_R |j\rangle_L |j\rangle_M |j\rangle_B |j\rangle_C,$$

with the $|j\rangle_C$ defined analogously to $|j\rangle_B$. To compare Bob's and Charlie's experiences we restrict attention to the diagonal elements of the *joint* density matrix ρ_{BC} associated with the joint random variable $\mathbf{BC}$. It can be easily verified that $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ are perfectly correlated, namely $Pr(\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C}) = 1$. In information theoretical terms, we have

$$I(\mathbf{B};\mathbf{C}) = H(\mathbf{B}) = H(\mathbf{C}),$$

where $I(\mathbf{B};\mathbf{C}) = H(\mathbf{B}) + H(\mathbf{C}) - H(\mathbf{BC})$ is the mutual information between $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$. The same happens when Charlie does not observe the readout of M, but instead measures L in the same basis $\{|j\rangle_L\}$ with his own apparatus N. Bob can also perform a *generalized* measurement on some physical system Q. This is done by entangling Q with L via some unitary operator acting on QL, and subsequently performing an elementary measurement on L, as described above. Note that the only mathematical difference between our treatment of measurement and Everett's lies in our focus on density matrices in $\mathcal{K}$ as the source of random variables. However, preparation, our next topic, is altogether new in this context.

(ii) **Preparation.**

Alice wishes to prepare some $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ according to an *ensemble* of pure states $\{(p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_Q) : i = 1, \ldots n\}$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i = 1$, by which we mean that the state $|\psi_i\rangle_Q$ is prepared with probability p_i. This can be accomplished by

1) measuring Q and bringing it into some fixed state $|0\rangle_Q$, thereby disentangling it from its original reference system.

2) performing conditional unitary operations according to the ensemble $\{(p_i, U_i) : i = 1, \ldots n\}$, such that $|\psi_i\rangle_Q = U_i|0\rangle_Q$.

We omit the description of process 1); suffice it to say that the end result is the system A_1Q being in the state

$$|\Psi\rangle_{A_1Q} = |0\rangle_{A_1}|0\rangle_Q,$$

where $A_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{Alice}$ and $|0\rangle_{A_1}$ represents Alice knowing that Q is in the state $|0\rangle_Q$. Now the outcome of process 2) is the creation of $A_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{Alice}$ so that the state of A_1QA_2 is

$$|\Psi\rangle_{A_1QA_2} = |0\rangle_{A_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{p_i}|\psi_i\rangle_Q|i\rangle_{A_2}, \tag{3}$$

where the basis state $|i\rangle_{A_2}$ stands for Alice knowing that she has performed the unitary operation U_i. Finally $A \in \mathcal{K}_{Alice}$ is produced giving rise to

$$|\Psi\rangle_{A_1QA_2A} = |0\rangle_{A_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{p_i}|\psi_i\rangle_Q|i\rangle_{A_2}|i\rangle_A, \tag{4}$$

where the basis state $|i\rangle_A$ represents Alice knowing that Q is in the state $|\psi_i\rangle_Q$ *after* the application of the conditional unitary transformation. The transition from (3) to (4) resembles a primitive quantum computation [1].

Upon preparation, the system Q is in the mixed state $\rho_Q = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_Q$. The density matrix ρ_A of A, viewed in the $|i\rangle_A$ basis, has diagonal elements p_i. Just as with Bob, these diagonal elements represent the probabilities of Alice experiencing the corresponding basis states and we associated them with the random variable $\mathbf{A}$.

(iii) **Communication.** Communication from Alice to Bob takes place by Alice encoding a message by preparing a physical system Q and Bob subsequently performing a generalized measurement on it. Thus the procedures of (i) and (ii) are combined, with the composite system QA_2A now playing the role of the reference system R. Consequently A and B become entangled via A_2QLM. The diagonal elements of their joint density matrix ρ_{AB} are now associated with the joint random variable $\mathbf{AB}$. The mutual information between what Alice prepared and what Bob received is simply $I(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$. Thus it can be read off very simply from the joint density matrix of Alice and Bob.

Directed entanglement and quantum channels. The theory hitherto presented suggests that all communication can be viewed as entanglement transfer. Initially the sender A is entangled with A_2Q only. Gradually the entanglement is passed on through L, M and finally to B, the receiver. Intuition suggests that the final entanglement between A and B cannot exceed the initial entanglement between A and Q. In addition, one would expect Alice's and Bob's diagonal vision to further reduce their "experienced" entanglement. We now make these ideas concrete by introducing the notion of *directed entanglement*.

Directed entanglement $E(X \to Y)$ from the system X to the system Y is defined as

$$E(X \to Y) = S(Y) - S(XY), \tag{5}$$

where $S(Y)$ is short for the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho_Y)$ of the density matrix ρ_Y, $S(\rho_Y) = -tr(\rho_Y \, log \, \rho_Y)$. $S(XY)$ is defined analogously. The connnection between E and entanglement was observed by Schumacher and Nielsen [7] when it first appeared in the guise of coherent information I_c. $E(X \to Y)$ may also be viewed as the negative of the conditional entropy $S(X|Y) = S(XY) - S(Y)$, a quantity investigated in some detail, albeit without physical context, in [1].

We list some useful properties of $E(X \to Y)$:

(a) $-S(X) \leq E(X \to Y) \leq S(X)$

(b) $E(X \to Y) \leq E(X \to YZ)$

(c) $E(XY \to Z) = E(X \to Z) + E(Y \to XZ)$

(d) $E(X \to YZ) \geq E(X \to Y) + E(X \to Z)$

(e) $E(XY \to ZW) \geq E(X \to Z) + E(Y \to W)$

(f) $E(X \to Y) \geq E(X \to Y^c) \geq E(X^c \to Y^c)$

(g) $E(X \to Y)$ is invariant under local unitary transformations $U_X \otimes U_Y$

(h) $-S(X) \leq E(X \to Y^c) \leq 0$

We omit the proofs, many of which can be found in [1]. In (b) equality holds when Z is disentangled from XY, and we shall refer to this fact as property (b′). Similarly, in (e) equality holds when XZ is disentangled from YW, and we label this by (e′). In (f) and (h), X^c refers to the *classicized* system X, stripped of its off-diagonal elements in some preferred basis. Note that $S(X^c) = H(\mathbf{X})$. We now use these properties to prove the two main theorems of classical and quantum information processing: the *Holevo bound* and the *quantum data processing inequality.*

Consider sending classical information over some noisy channel $\mathcal{E} : \rho_Q \to \mathcal{E}(\rho_Q)$. This differs from (iii) in that the system Q gets entangled with some unobserved environment E (via some unitary transformation U_{QE}) between the preparation and measurement phases. The total system involved in the process is thus AA_2QELMB. Just after the interaction with E the system AQ is described by the density matrix

$$\rho_{AQ} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle\langle i|_A \mathcal{E}(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_Q),$$

and hence

$$E(A \to Q) = \chi - H(\mathbf{A}),$$

where the *Holevo quantity* χ is given by

$$\chi = S(\mathcal{E}(\rho_Q)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i S(\mathcal{E}(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_Q)).$$

Denoting by primes quantities calculated after the interaction with LMB, we have the following string of equalities and inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} E(A \to Q) &= E(A \to QLMB) = E'(A \to QLMB) \\ &\geq E'(A \to B) \geq E'(A^c \to B^c) = H(\mathbf{B}) - H(\mathbf{AB}). \end{aligned}$$

The first four relations are due to (b′), (g), (b), and (f) respectively. This gives rise to the Holevo bound

$$I(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B}) \leq \chi. \tag{6}$$

Equality is asymptotically achieved by block coding in the limit of large blocklength [8].

One can also send *quantum* information over a noisy channel. Consider the physical system Q being sent through two noisy channels $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ consecutively. Thus Q, initially entangled with the reference system R only, gets entangled first with E_1 and then with E_2 via some U_{AE_1} and U_{AE_2}, respectively. We denote by primes quantities calculated after the interaction with environment E_1 and by double primes those calculated after the interaction with E_2. Then we have, by (b),

$$E''(R \to QE_1E_2) \geq E''(R \to QE_2) \geq E''(R \to Q).$$

Noting $E''(R \to QE_1E_2) = E(R \to QE_1E_2) = E(R \to Q)$ and $E''(R \to QE_2) = E'(R \to QE_2) = E'(R \to Q)$, both consequences of (g) and (b′), we get the quantum data processing inequality

$$S(\rho_Q) \geq I_c(\rho_Q, \mathcal{E}_1) \geq I_c(\rho_Q, \mathcal{E}_2 \circ \mathcal{E}_1), \tag{7}$$

where I_c is the coherent information [7]. Equality is again achieved asymptotically [9].

We have seen that the key quantum noisy channel relations for sending classical (6) and quantum (7) information both follow from the properties of directed entanglement. [1] We expect this to open avenues, e.g., for adapting the quantum channel coding techniques developed by Lloyd [9] to produce classical codes saturating the Holevo bound, just like Schumacher compression may be applied to classically prepared information.

Quantum thermodynamics. With the developments of the previous sections it becomes clear that the *thermodynamic entropy can only be defined relative to elements of* $\mathcal{K}$. We define the thermodynamic entropy $S_T(Q|B)$ of a system Q relative to $B \in \mathcal{K}_{Bob}$ as

$$S_T(Q|B) = S(Q|B^c) = -E(Q \to B^c), \tag{8}$$

i.e. it is the negative of the directed entanglement from Q to the classicized system B. In terms of standard quantum mechanics, it corresponds to the average von Neumann entropy of the system Q "as viewed by Bob" upon measuring or preparing it. By property (h), it lies between 0 and $S(Q)$, the upper bound attained when B is disentangled from Q.

Of course, our definitions of the thermodynamic entropy must be justified by the zeroth and second laws of thermodynamics [10]. For proving the zeroth law it suffices that the sum of thermodynamic entropies of two initially unentangled systems cannot decrease when they interact (see [10] for a full treatment). This, in turn, follows from properties (b) and (c), which give $S_T(Q_1|B) + S_T(Q_2|B) \geq S_T(Q_1Q_2|B)$, and noting that equality holds when Q_1 and Q_2 are unentangled.

The second law is somewhat more subtle, and holds only for macroscopic systems. The Hilbert space of our macroscopic system Q may be divided into a tensor product $\mathcal{H}_Q = \mathcal{H}_{Q^>} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Q^<}$, where $Q^>$ and $Q^<$ represent the macroscopic and microscopic degrees of freedom, respectively. The second law is a consequence of the lack of knowledge of the microstructure of the physical system, and the macrostructure being converted into microstructure as the system evolves [11]. Accordingly, it is the *coarse-grained* entropy, $S_T^>(Q|B) \equiv S_T(Q^>|B)$, i.e. the thermodynamic entropy of $Q^>$, that increases. To prove this we introduce a dummy system $\widetilde{B} \in \mathcal{K}_{Bob}$ which keeps track of Bob's (nonexistent) knowledge of $Q^>$, and hence remains disentangled from QB at all times. Initially B is maximally entangled with $Q^>$, as a consequence of preparation or measurement, and $Q^<$ has a uniform density matrix and is disentangled from $BQ^>$. By property (e′) we have $E(Q^>Q^< \to B^c\widetilde{B}) = E(Q^> \to B^c) + E(Q^< \to \widetilde{B})$. Since Q is closed, it evolves via some unitary operator $U_{Q^>Q^<}$, entangling $Q^>$ and $Q^<$, so that $E'(Q^>Q^< \to B^c\widetilde{B}) = E(Q^>Q^< \to B^c\widetilde{B})$ by (g). Property (e) implies $E'(Q^>Q^< \to B^c\widetilde{B}) \geq E'(Q^> \to B^c) + E'(Q^< \to \widetilde{B})$, and hence (in obvious notation) $\Delta E(Q^> \to B^c) + \Delta E(Q^< \to \widetilde{B}) \leq 0$. Since $Q^<$ initially had a uniform density matrix, it follows that $\Delta E(Q^< \to \widetilde{B}) \geq 0$. Therefore $\Delta E(Q^> \to B^c) \leq 0$, i.e. $S_T^>(Q|B)$ has increased. There is, however, no a priori reason why $S_T^>(Q|B)$ should *continue* to increase since the density matrix of $Q^<$ is not uniform any more. At this point we invoke the idea, central to Wilson's renormalization group, that the many lengthscales of Q are *locally coupled* [12]. Hence we may further decompose the Hilbert space of $Q^<$ into spaces of increasing size, corresponding to decreasing lengthscales, $\mathcal{H}_Q = \mathcal{H}_{Q_0} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Q_1} \otimes \cdots$, in such a way that the time evolution entangles only neighboring spaces, causing a cascade effect. In the light of this principle, the above calculation is now modified by replacing $Q^<$ with Q_0. After $Q^>$ and Q_0 interact, Q_0 will interact with the completely uniform (and larger in size) Q_1, which will thoroughly randomize it. Thus, when $Q^>$ and Q_0 interact again, $Q^<$ starts off with a uniform density matrix so that $S_T^>(Q|B)$ continues to increase. The cascade continues, the vast microscopic degrees of freedom constantly radomizing

[1] It should be stressed that the proofs given are mathematically akin to already existing ones [1], only reexpressed in the common language of entanglement transfer.

the more macroscopic ones, until thermodynamic equilibrium is reached. Interestingly, the same method works if we consider the second law to be a consequence of interactions with an unobserved environment, rather than coarse graining [13]. The microscopic degrees of freedom are, in essence, an unobserved environment.

The model presented provides a simplified and unified view of physics and communication, with directed entanglement (5) as the key binding quantity. As advertised, correlated random variables come about rather naturally, and drawbacks of the Copenhagen interpretation mentioned in the introduction are taken care of. Mixed density operators are *always* a consequence of entanglement, and both classical and quantum communication over quantum channels are seen as the transfer of entanglement. Correlated random variables describing the conceptual experience of various protagonists arise from the entanglement between different instances of knowledge, interpreted through diagonal vision. These instances of knowledge are always entangled via some physical system. In (i) Bob and Charlie experienced the same measurement result due to being entangled via Q. Alternatively, Charlie could have learned the measurement outcome by Bob communicating it to him, in which case they would get entangled indirectly via some physical system used to encode the message. Finally, quantum thermodynamic entropy is defined as the lack of entanglement between instances of knowledge and physical systems. In addition we have presented a simple and intuitive proof of the second law of thermodynamics. Thus the model promises to become a very practical framework for understanding and developing quantum information theory and quantum thermodynamics. On a philosophical level it makes Bohr's insight that the wavefunction merely represents knowledge much more precise by relating it to the *true* carriers of Shannon information – random variables.

Acknowledgments. We are indebted to R. Maimon for constructive criticism of earlier versions of the manuscript. We also thank Z. Hadžibabić, J. Karcz, D. Milanov, M. Milosavljević and K. Narayan for useful discussions. I.D. acknowledges the partial support of the DoD Multidisciplinary University Research Initiative (MURI) program administered by the Army Research Office under Grant DAAD19-99-1-0215 while at Cornell University.

References

[1] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge U.P., Cambridge, UK (2001)

[2] J. A. Wheeler in *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, W. H. Zurek, ed., Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, CA (1991)

[3] E. Wigner in *The Role of consciousness in the physical world*, R. G. Jahn ed., Westview Press, Boulder, CO (1981)

[4] C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver, *The mathematical theory of communication*, U. Illinois Press, Urbana, IL (1949)

[5] H. Everett, III in *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, B.S. DeWitt, N. Graham, eds., Princeton U.P., Princeton, NJ (1973)

[6] H.P. Stapp, quant-ph/0110148 (2001)

[7] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629 (1996)

[8] A.S. Holevo, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44(1)**, 269 (1996); B. Schumacher and M.D. Westmoreland, *Phys.Rev.A* **56**, 131 (1998);

[9] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**,1613 (1996)

[10] M.H. Partovi, *Phys. Lett. A* **137**, 440, (1989)

[11] J.R. Waldram, *The Theory of Thermodynamics*, Cambridge U.P., Cambridge, UK (1985); A. Wehrl, *Rev. Mod. Phys* **50**, 221 (1978)

[12] K.G. Wilson, *Rev. Mod. Phys* **47**, 773 (1975)

[13] M.H. Partovi, *Phys. Lett. A* **137**, 445, (1989)